THEOLOGY

VOL. LXIII JUNE, 1960 No. 480

The Witness of the Russian Church

IN spite of the long history of Anglo-Russian church relations, and the splendid work of organizations such as the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association and the Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius, there is still a great deal of ignorance concerning the realities of church life in the U.S.S.R. This ignorance was a serious enough matter during the years when all human possibilities of communication were cut off; it is even more serious now that the Church of England is engaged in theological conversations with the Russian Orthodox Church, and the Moscow Patriarchate itself is becoming able to take an active interest in the World Council of Churches. In the paragraphs which follow, I endeavour to deal briefly with some of the main misunderstandings.

The first concerns the scale and vitality of church-life in modern Russia. If there are few Anglicans who believe that "nearly all Russians are members of the Communist Party", there are many who appear to believe that only a very small proportion of the population attend church services. By a fortunate coincidence competent German, English and French observers[1] have recently published the results of independent estimates of the number of those who go openly and regularly to church in the Soviet Union. They all arrive at a figure of 25 to 30 million regular church-goers in a total population of 220 million, including the 7 million members of the Communist Party and 25 million declared Moslems, Buddhists or Jews. As Professor Schlink points out forcibly, this means that, despite all obstacles, in proportion to the population *church-goers on Sundays in the U.S.S.R. are at least as numerous as they are in Western Europe,* and they are indeed far more numerous (both absolutely and in proportion) than regular church-goers in England. Moreover, it must be remembered that week-day church attendances are very much higher in the U.S.S.R. than in the so-called "Christian" countries; that at Easter time and other major festivals, vastly greater numbers of people crowd round the Russian churches (when there is no more room inside them in spite of the multiplication of services), and that there must be a great but unknown number of faithful Christians in Russia who for good reasons do not openly attend church under present conditions.

But it is frequently said that all these worshippers are old women, with the implication that church attendance in the U.S.S.R. is a very negligible and transient phenomenon. One might begin to answer this objection by asking what Western European Church has

[1] Edmund Schlink, *Kerygma und Dogma*, Göttingen, No. 3, 1958; John Lawrence, *Frontier*, London, July 1958; Jacques Nantet, *Blackfriars*, July–August 1959.

the right to cast stones at another because its worshippers are mostly older women? But there are also some objective factors to be considered. First, owing to the appalling losses in the war there are still (according to the Soviet Government's own census figures) twenty million fewer men than women in the U.S.S.R. Secondly, partly for the same reason, there is the greatest pressure on all younger people, married women and mothers as well as men, to go out to work and to work exceedingly hard. Thirdly, it is notoriously difficult to estimate the real ages of Russian women, especially when they are swathed in shawls and winter coats. Fourthly, counts by visitors while confirming the great preponderance of older women at week-day services in working hours, indicate that on Sundays and some other special occasions, the proportion of men is higher. (A rough count in one particular church on a major saint's day which fell at a week-end, indicated that as many as one-third of those present were men.) There never seem to be more than about 5 per cent. really young men or women at the most, though some visitors say that there are more younger women in the churches to-day than there were ten years ago. In any case, as it is now forty-two years since the Revolution, many of those now attending cannot have received any organized religious instruction . . . The full facts about church attendance (especially outside the big cities) are very hard to obtain, but what is certain is that the pressure of press-propaganda, educational and youth organizations and all the organs of public life *against* church-going in the U.S.S.R. is extremely strong. Under these conditions, I have no doubt that we should be deeply grateful for the steadfast public witness of so many of our fellow-Christians in Russia.

The people who come to the churches in their thousands give generously. I once asked a Russian bishop what was his greatest problem. He replied unexpectedly: "We have too much money!" Under the Soviet law the money received in collections and from the sale of candles can be spent on only two things: the maintenance of church buildings and the requirements of the liturgy, and the salaries of the clergy. It may not be spent on any form of charitable work, on education (except for theological seminaries) or on publications (except for very limited editions of Bibles and service books). Consequently the priests of a city church may be paid 4,000 to 6,000 roubles a month, earnings equivalent to those of university lecturers or Stakhanovite workers: (the monthly earnings of a labourer are around 800 roubles). People are beginning to say: the clergy live on the fat of the land! Many suspect that the motives for allowing the Church to accumulate so much money may well be Machiavellian. Certainly we can see that the present financial position of the Church creates many pastoral problems and temptations.

There is no problem of finding enough recruits for the priesthood. Delegations have been assured again and again that there is no lack of ordinands in spite of the fact that most of them come straight on from ten years of Soviet schooling. Candidates are carefully selected. But real problems do arise for theological teachers who are aware

of the gap between traditional teaching and contemporary thought and scholarship. Let me take an extremely painful current example. In December 1959, Professor Alexander Ossipov (who read the paper on "Holy Scripture" at the Anglo-Russian theological conference at Moscow in 1956), published a three-column article in *Pravda,* in which he explained why he had broken with the Church and renounced the Christian faith. (It is of course his own explanation of his apostasy and for a complete story one would have to know a good deal more of what others could tell of his character and motives; but he does express a real dilemma if in the most extreme form.) His doubts began, he said, when he saw a gulf opening between the traditional interpretation of the Bible and the results of his own independent scientific study of it. Next he was shaken by the opposition of some church authorities to his policy of encouraging theological students to attend theatres and cinemas and to read modern Soviet novels and poetry. Disciplinary troubles complicated the situation, and the final break was precipitated by a clash between professors on the question whether students should or should not be allowed to read the anti-religious articles appearing in the daily press. Here in a sharp and most distressing way we see brought to light one of the great dilemmas of Christian teachers and preachers in Russia. Should they concentrate exclusively on the basic "timeless" elements of the faith interpreted in strictly traditional language, or should they venture on the extremely difficult and even dangerous road of trying to show more explicitly how the "faith once delivered to the saints" is relevant to the varying conditions of modern life and thought, and particularly to the outlook of generations brought up in the atmosphere of Marxist-Leninist materialism? And it must be remembered that this question has to be answered in a situation in which it is forbidden by law to give organized religious instruction to children under eighteen or to make any kind of "religious propaganda" outside the churches. (It is inconceivable, for example, that anything like a Student Christian Movement would be allowed in the universities.) At present it is not, I think, unfair to say that both the Marxists and many Christian teachers in Russia operate with what most Anglican theologians would regard as outmoded nineteenth-century categories in their thinking about the Bible. There has been as yet no Russian *Lux Mundi* and the task of producing one is infinitely harder in modern Russia than in nineteenth-century England.

Next there is a whole complex of "problems" concerning the extraordinary and in some respects necessarily mysterious relationships between the Christian churches and the Soviet State. The State does not deny the patriotic, unifying and civilizing work of the Russian Church in the middle ages. One of the modern metro stations in Moscow is decorated by mosaics showing the soldier saints Alexander Nevsky and Dimitry Donskoy carrying large and unmistakable icons, and enormous sums are being spent by the atheist Russian State on the restoration of the fabrics, wall-paintings and icons of some of the historic churches, now museums (such as the

cathedrals of the Kremlin), which are visited daily by thousands of Russian tourists.

But State and Party have a totally different attitude to Christianity as a living faith to-day. "Religious faith" of any kind is regarded as an obstacle to Soviet progress. Every means short of open persecution (which has been found to toughen rather than dissuade many believers) must be used to hasten the conversion of all to materialism. Up to 1941 the actual, living, worshipping churches in Russia were subjected to a degree of hostile propaganda and of police and administrative pressure, which we who are outside the U.S.S.R. can only describe as "persecution". But from the time of the German invasion in 1941, this "pressure" was somewhat relaxed and in 1943 the Church was allowed to come out into the open and elect a Patriarch after an interregnum of eighteen years.

It would be a great mistake to regard this relaxation as being due in any sense to the "conversion" of the Party. On the contrary, State and Party maintain to this day the basic Marxist-Leninist teaching that religion is an illusion. But in the war years it seemed to experienced observers (such as Archbishop Garbett) that Stalin had three good "political" reasons for a change of outward policy: (i) at a time of very great strain the *morale* of many Russian citizens could be supported by a greater freedom of worship; (ii) the church leaders had proved themselves to be good patriots and loyal to the government (though they never disguised their rejection of materialist philosophy), and (iii) public opinion in Britain and America would be favourably impressed by some gesture indicating a measure of relaxation of the pressure on the churches. (And in any case the Communists were convinced that in a scientific socialist society religion would eventually wither away.)

In the post-war years (after what must have been a particularly critical moment in 1945), church and government leaders have reached a *modus vivendi*. The Church is accorded a certain liberty of worship (not at all the same thing as "religious freedom" as this is generally understood in the West); anti-religious propaganda through the press and other channels has continued, and has indeed been somewhat intensified in the last two years; but the church leaders apparently find little difficulty in supporting the government and especially its "peace" propaganda (e.g. through the World Peace Council), first because after the terrible experiences of the last war Russians including church people genuinely long for peace; and secondly, because in a country in which for forty years every source of education and information has been controlled by the government in its own interest, it is inevitable that church leaders should accept the official view of how peace can be maintained. Their attitude may create problems for us; but there should be no great difficulty in understanding why Russian church leaders speak as they do on, e.g. questions of international policy.

Many people draw from these facts the conclusion that the Russian Church is a little better than a propaganda agency of the Communist State, or alternatively that it merely perpetuates a completely other-

worldly, anachronistic and "superstitions" interpretation of the Christian faith. I believe that the true interpretation is quite different. The Russian Church is a living Church of Jesus Christ which is bearing a remarkable Christian witness in the extraordinarily unfavourable conditions of a highly centralized and avowedly atheistic state. It is an unforgettable experience to take part in a service in a crowded Orthodox Church in Russia. The fervour and devotion of the worshippers is evident in their faces and in their singing. Many of the church leaders and priests are men of great intelligence and deep faith tried in the fire of suffering. The theological students are no longer drawn as in pre-revolutionary Russia mostly from the families of priests, but come from families which represent a good cross-section of the population, and their keenness makes an excellent impression.

There has been a striking revival of preaching. Sermons are preached two or three times a Sunday and on several week-days in most city churches. Homiletics have an important place in the curricula of the theological seminaries. The content of the preaching (as illustrated for example by the published sermons of Metropolitan Nicolai) is evangelical with a lively use of illustrations from the Fathers. To the question: What is your Church's social witness? The Russian theologians reply cogently: We teach in accordance with Paul's hymn to "Charity" in First Corinthians XIII. Furthermore, Russian Christians have a lively sense of the power of intercession!

Above all, the Russian Church has preserved that "one pearl" for the possession of which every other form of religious liberty and material advantage would if necessary be given up, namely the right to celebrate the Holy Liturgy, which brings heaven to earth and unites earth to heaven. The Liturgy constantly witnesses to God's great deeds of salvation in history and to the eschatological expectation of the new creation which has dawned already in the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Hence, as Professor Edmund Schlink writes,[1] "the message of the cosmic victory of Christ's resurrection is so tremendous and all-powerful that it completely transforms the relation of the Christians to their oppressors . . . The certainty of Christ's victory gives them spiritual freedom and strength to forgive instead of abusing and complaining; to love, to bless, to pray, and through this to await with confidence the spiritual . . . transformation of their enemies." In a speech to the Central Committee of the World Council when it met at Rhodes in 1960,[2] Professor Schlink added: "Every dimension of church life is concentrated in its liturgy in such a way that the Eastern Church has not only been protected in times of oppression; from this focal point it can also constantly receive fresh power to push out into the world . . . The Eastern Church interprets its ethical task to be the transformation and sanctification of men rather than the passing of new social and legal ordinances.

[1] *Kerygma und Dogma*, No. 3, 1958, Göttingen.
[2] Published in *The Ecumenical Review*, XII, No. 2, Geneva.

But where there is a genuine renewal of men and women to faith, love and hope this is bound to have an effect upon the social order."

Many years ago, before the Revolution, Stephen Graham wrote a book about the Russian Church called *The Way of Martha and the Way of Mary*. In a very deep sense I believe that our fellow-Christians in Russia have the right and the ability out of their experience to remind Western Christians of our Lord's words: "Martha, Martha, thou art careful and troubled about many things; but one thing is needful, and Mary has chosen that good part which shall not be taken away from her" (Luke 10. 41–42).

FRANCIS H. HOUSE.

Liturgical Revision and a Theology of Incorporation

A PRAYER BOOK revision anywhere gives us an opportunity to discuss general liturgical and theological problems in concrete terms. No matter how much we may deprecate the loss of primitive liturgical flexibility, it is probably true to say that we are never entirely comfortable about the fact that the "parish next door" is living a different liturgical life by different liturgical standards. A Prayer Book revision provides an opportunity for particular aspirations to be made universal, at least in one province of the Church. Further, a sound revision may teach pragmatically those principles of Christian worship which some will never learn through study and research.

In the remarks which follow I want to offer a discussion of some aspects of the Canadian revision which found approval at the recent sessions of the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Canada. Although I am a Canadian (and personally regret the line taken by the revision committee in certain respects) I am convinced that the problems involved are not limited in significance to the Canadian Church. In England (where there is probably less liturgical restraint than elsewhere in the Anglican communion) they must be considered by all who are involved in pastoral and liturgical renewal and experiment.

One of the most interesting features of English liturgical adaptation in recent years has been the widespread increase in the use of the so-called "Interim Rite": the joining of the Prayer of Oblation and the Lord's Prayer to the end of the 1662 Prayer of Consecration to produce a eucharistic canon that is similar in shape (if not always in content) to the classical canons of Christendom. The Interim Rite has not found its current frequency of use without a large portion of theological criticism from both the evangelical and catholic parties of the Church. Dr Mascall, for example, has criticized the Interim Rite as homocentric: "One need only compare the interim rite with the classical canons of Christendom," he says, "to see how very inadequate it is. For where they are concerned with making eucharist to God, it is almost entirely preoccupied with the worshippers. The

sacrifice is '*our* sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' . . . 'That we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of *our* sins. . . .' "[1] It is reassuring to find that the Canadian revisers have made a genuine effort to recover the thanksgiving quality that belongs to a eucharistic canon: the Prayer of Consecration in the draft book begins with an ascription of "Blessing and glory and thanksgiving" and the words of Institution are followed by an anamnesis of the death, resurrection and ascension of our Lord, in anticipation of His return in glory.

However, the most pointed and constant criticism that the Interim Rite has received has been levelled against the clause in the Prayer of Oblation in which we "offer and present . . . ourselves our souls and bodies . . ." and against the recitation of the Lord's Prayer before communion. It has been objected that it is not (liturgically) fitting for us to offer ourselves or to say "Our Father" until after the act of communion. The Canadian revision committee has ingeniously expressed this objection in two ways: by inserting the clause "And here we offer and present . . ." in a new post-communion prayer in combination with elements from the 1662 Prayer of Thanksgiving, and by leaving the Lord's Prayer in its 1662 position immediately after the communion. This is a sufficiently radical departure from the pattern of Prayer Book revision in other provinces of the Anglican communion to warrant some exploration of the attitudes that lie behind it.

Dr C. F. D. Moule has summed up the position of many evangelical critics of the Interim Rite in the conclusion to his brief book *The Sacrifice of Christ*. He says he feels "the great importance of stressing the once-and-for-all uniqueness of Christ's sacrifice and the utterly dependent and derived character of ours", and is therefore "inclined still to welcome the 1662 position of the Prayer of Oblation", desiring only that its recitation be made compulsory rather than alternative to the postcommunion Prayer of Thanksgiving. And it is the clause in which we "offer ourselves" that seems particularly to disturb Dr Moule. Not that he disapproves of such an offering: "We do," he says, "offer sacrifice at Holy Communion . . . we offer the sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies, of our praise and thanksgiving"; but Dr Moule wants us to continue to make such an offering only after communion.

Similarly, Reginald H. Fuller, remarking on Galatians 4. 1–7 in his book on liturgical preaching, makes the following statement:

[1] However, lest anyone use this as an excuse for interpolating the Roman Canon into the Anglican liturgy, it is worth noting that the same effect can be produced by a judicious use of italics in the Roman eucharistic prayer: "which, first, *we* offer unto thee" . . . "for whom *we* offer unto thee: or who *themselves* offer unto thee this sacrifice of praise, for *themselves*, and for all to whom they are bound: for the redemption of *their* souls, for the hope of *their* salvation." . . . "This oblation of *our* bounden service . . . order *our* days in thy peace and bid *us* to be delivered from eternal damnation" . . . "that, as many of *us* as by this partaking of the altar shall receive the most sacred Body and Blood of thy Son, may be fulfilled with all heavenly benediction and grace." . . . "To *us* sinners also, thy servants. . . ."

"This aspect of the communion—the renewal of our baptismal adoption as sons in the Son—is brought out in the 1662 Communion service, in which the people join with the priest saying 'Our Father . . .' only *after* they have received the sacrament." It would appear that we are once again equipped to say "Our Father", to take our place as sons in the Son, by the act of communion.

The remarks of Dr Moule and Mr Fuller and the policy adopted by the Canadian revision committee lead us to a very difficult problem: just what is the status of the Christian in the context of a celebration of the eucharist? Is the whole eucharistic action (the taking of bread and wine, the giving of thanks for creation and redemption, the breaking of the bread and the eating and drinking) simply the means by which we liturgically acquire the status of right-worshippers after the last of the actions is complete? Or can we say that the whole eucharistic action is itself the summit of Christian corporate worship? that it is itself our participation in the unrepeatable Sacrifice—a participation for which we prepare in the offertory, which we articulate in the Thanksgiving and to which we express our lifelong relationship in the Breaking and the Communion? Are we to say that the act of communion makes us more Christian than we were before the liturgy began? Are we to suggest that the act of communion somehow "chalks up our score" with God? The Canadian revision restricts our liturgical recognition of ourselves as sons in the Son to the prayers which follow communion; this is an attitude which comes remarkably close to implying a doctrine of the repetition of eucharistic initiation as a substitute for the medieval doctrine of the eucharistic repetition of the sacrifice of Christ. What, we must ask, is the work of baptism and what is the relationship between baptism and the eucharist?

An examination of primitive forms of initiation into the Christian fellowship reveals a pattern in which the candidate normally was incorporated into the death and resurrection of Christ in water baptism, received his status in the Spirit-filled community in Christation and immediately participated in the eucharistic offering. The step from baptismal incorporation into Christ's death to eucharistic participation in his death was immediate. I do not think it is an exaggeration to say that being a Christian (sacramentally) involves three things: baptism, confirmation and first communion and second communion and third communion *ad infinitum*. Baptism and the eucharist are together the ground of the church; they are the two points at which the fellowship of redemption is created. We might say that we are baptized in order to do the eucharist and we do the eucharist because we are baptized.

Part of the problem of our approach to baptism arises from the fact that baptism is performed by the church in relation to an individual who is (at any given performance of the rite) the sole focus of the church's action. The Christian bystanders see an individual being initiated into their number, i.e. into the Body of Christ; they see an individual being born anew into the perfect manhood of Christ, and they tend to regard his spiritual birth as

analogous to the birth of human generation in which the new-born infant once born is separated from the act of his birth by the fact that he is in time and society an individual being with a rational nature. This view overlooks the fact that the new birth of baptism is really a birth into the new creation, and we would do better to find our analogies in terms of creation than in terms of human birth. Just as creation is ontologically the consequent of the continuous creative act of the God Who Is, by whom the round world is "made continually", so the new creation derives in all of its parts from the recreative act of Redemption. Baptism is not simply the "terminus a quo" of the Christian life; it is the focus of the divine Word of re-creation which constantly constitutes the Christian life. Just as the divine "fiat" constitutes the whole of creation, which from the "first" it has called into being and thus into fellowship with God—even so, this same divine "fiat", through the fulness of fellowship with man by the taking of flesh, constitutes the new creation of the baptized.

The eucharist is the worship of the new creation: the showing forth of the Lord's death by and in the Body of Christ. We are always stepping from baptism to the eucharist; we approach the eucharist on the strength of our baptism; in the eucharist we experience that which God has made us in baptism. The Lord's Prayer entered the liturgy not as an affirmation of a *new* status conferred by the most recent act of communion, but as a preparation for the act of communion immediately before it took place. Tertullian linked the petition for daily bread with the eucharistic meal and St Augustine saw the plea "forgive us our trespasses" as a statement of the sense of unworthiness with which the Christian ought to consummate the eucharistic worship in himself by the act of partaking of the holy food. I am not so much distressed because the Canadian Church has ignored this primitive form of communion devotion as I am distressed because the Canadian revision (and the ideas of Dr Moule and Mr Fuller) seems to denigrate the place of baptism in relation to the eucharist and to ignore the fact that we only do the eucharist because we have already been buried and raised with Christ. It was baptism that gave the primitive Christian the right to say "Our Father", and for this reason the church normally recited the Lord's Prayer aloud only in the context of the anaphora when the catechumens and unbelievers had been excluded from the company of the faithful. The Lord's Prayer looked back to the conferring of sonship and forward to the sacramental participation in the consecrated gifts.

We are, of course, never going to have a liturgy that really expresses our status as sons in the Son (and really shows the unity of the eucharistic actions with the central prayer of thanksgiving for creation and redemption) until the exhortation, confession, absolution and comfortable words are removed from the confusing position in which they now stand, i.e. between the offertory and the consecration. One hopes that the Canadian revisers have retained this structure simply because of conservatism and affection for the liturgy of 1662. However, the 1662 position of the so-called "communion de-

votions" has not been without its apologists in England at least, and they have propounded a theology which also seems to raise the problem of the relation between baptism and the eucharist.

A considerable attempt at restoration of lay participation in the offertory has been made at Clare College, Cambridge, where a loaf of bread baked in the college kitchens and a decanter of wine from the college cellars are carried by laymen to the altar at the Sunday eucharist. The liturgy as celebrated at Clare College has been privately published in a small volume that contains parallel columns of explanation and exegesis. Opposite the general confession the following note appears: "The bread and wine we have offered, our lives as they naturally are, are part of the old, sinful order. Before they and we can be united with the life of Jesus Christ in all its purity and power, we must be stripped down in utter penitence." I find the implied theology of this note very disturbing for it suggests a double offering in the eucharist, an offering of ourselves to which the offering of Christ is sacramentally added, and it eliminates the significance of the doctrine of justification by faith and denigrates the place of baptism.

If there is any distinction in the eucharist between our offering and the offering of Christ it is only the distinction that exists between the vine and the branches and the head and the members; there can really be only one offering: the offering of Christ in which we were incorporated, through faith, by baptism. As Dr Mascall has put it, the eucharistic offering is not the priest offering Christ, nor Christians offering themselves, but *the whole Christ*, head and members, offering *the whole Christ* to the glory of God the Father. It is not possible for the Christian to bring "the old sinful order" to the eucharistic offering simply because that order has been done away in the death of Christ, of which the Christian has been made a member already through baptism. ". . . ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him." For St Paul the eucharist seems to be a showing of the Lord's death by and in that community which is already dead and buried with Christ in baptism and which already lives in the life of the risen Christ.

The long and agonized process through which the early Church attempted to deal with the problem of post-baptismal sin reveals that it regarded such sin as an act which separated the individual from the eucharistic community and deprived him of the right to bring himself, his soul and body, to the offering of the Whole Christ by the Whole Christ in the eucharistic oblation. Indeed, the act of participating in the offertory is the act whereby the individual asserts that he is a member of the redeemed community; thus the whole eucharistic action is the crown and completion of the Christian life and not a means of restoration to the Christian life. No matter how normal sin may be to us from a human point of view, from the point of view of our baptism it is never normal. The normality of sin is always dependent on its frequency to the baptized believer; it is *accidentally* not *essentially* normal. To say that we may litur-

gically offer the sinful order and later purify it by confession and absolution (and, indeed, to say that we are not able to recite the Lord's Prayer or offer ourselves as members of the Whole Christ until after communion) is to regard sin as normal to the Christian life, baptism as an important but transitory event in the past and the eucharist as a medicinal remedy rather than a real participation in the glorious sacrifice of the Risen Lord by the redeemed community.

Christian worship is always the worship of the redeemed: we pray as sons in the Son; we pray as the children of God. We approach the holy table in the New Humanity; we offer ourselves because we are already members of him who offered himself for us and us in himself. This does not eliminate the need for an expression of unworthiness that he should so have loved us as he has already shown; but it does mean that the place for solemn, corporate expressions of deep penitence and for solemn declarations of absolution is outside the context of the eucharistic liturgy in recognition of the fact that sin "excommunicates" us and deprives us of the right to offer. I think it is unfortunate that the Canadian revisers did not move the communion devotions to a point outside the sequence of the actions of taking, giving thanks, breaking and eating and drinking. Even the synaxis, however, with its concentration on the proclamation of the Gospel within the body of the redeemed (didache and paradosis rather than kerygma) is possibly unsuitable for a general confession and absolution. Perhaps what we need is a separate service of preparation—a liturgical expression of the fact that repentance and absolution are the means whereby we *return* to the fellowship of baptism and the eucharist from which a rebellious act has separated us.

In these remarks I have tried to offer a discussion of two aspects of the revised Prayer Book of the Canadian Church, against the background of contemporary English apology for the liturgical order that the Canadian revisers have retained. It is, of course, the order of 1662 and some may wonder why I did not add one more faggot to the fire of criticism that our ancient rite has received during the last few decades. My reason is this: there are many in England who recognize the inadequacies of the 1662 liturgy. There are many who would agree with the words I have heard attributed to the first bishop of the Episcopal Church in the United States: "I believe that the liturgy of 1662 is perfectly valid but I could never celebrate it." The Interim Rite is widely used in most of England and many clergy are content to continue its use until the interim is past. But the Canadian Church has decided that there is to be no further interim: a new liturgy has been prepared and I offer this criticism because I believe that the new liturgy could better express that which the eucharist essentially is: the sacramental participation by the people of God in the Mystery of Redemption.

These are not dry archaeological questions: the answers they evoke may affect the comprehensibility of our service and the conformity of our worship to the "One Faith revealed in Holy Writ,

and defined in the Creeds as maintained by the undivided primitive church", to which the Canadian Church professed its adherence in the Solemn Declaration of General Synod in 1893.

PAUL GIBSON.

Religion and Medicine: Priest and Doctor: Church and Hospital — II

Introduction.—We have examined in a previous article[1] the relationship between Religion and Medicine, and seen how Medicine belongs within the context of the good news of the Kingdom of God as a part of God's redemptive work of healing his creation: how natural methods of healing subserve the purposes of love.

But doctors, especially those in the big teaching hospitals, remain unaware of what the Church is trying to do. In the B.M.A. Report on Divine Healing and Co-operation between Doctors and Clergy (1956),[2] in the sections on religious aspects of healing,[3] there is recognition of the effects of religious conversion on behaviour patterns and certain neuroses and functional disorders; of the effects of suggestion, "which are likely to be more effective when backed by the belief in Divine help"; and of the uplifting of morale due to increasing a patient's confidence. But there is no understanding of the Church's task as a whole: the Ministry of Healing has got out of context.

The B.M.A. Report set out to find evidence of physical healing due to spiritual ministrations. But there is implicit in that search a divorce between natural and supernatural. The Church is not putting forward some spiritual alternative or better way of "getting results": she regards the work of Medicine itself as a vital part of the task of making men and women whole persons. There is a part of that task which calls for physical remedies such as vaccination and penicillin. But there is no physical remedy which cannot also be the means of spiritual grace.

The very title, "Church's Ministry of Healing", is misleading to doctors, for it implies something separate from Medicine, whereas, in practice, it must embrace Medicine. Nor can the Church's ministry to the sick be divorced from her ministry to the healthy. As a Church, basically, we are trying to do exactly the same thing for the sick as for the "healthy". And the doctor is as much our quarry as his patient. But Medicine is justifiably confused about our Ministry, because, for the most part, *the Church is not doing it.*

The Present Position in Hospitals

Under the National Health Service it is necessary to have an average of 750 beds occupied before a full-time chaplain is employed.

---

[1] THEOLOGY, May 1960, pp. 181–7.
[2] *Divine Healing and Co-operation between Doctors and Clergy*, B.M.A., 1956.
[3] Vid. sup., paras 22–9.

Imagine a doctor with 750 beds! Yet in many ways a pastoral ministry is *more* time-consuming, not less, than a doctor's.

Hospital chaplains are extremely overworked, often reduced to little more than laying-on services and administering the sacraments. It is amazing how much many men accomplish; but what time is there for quiet, for teaching patients and gaining their confidence, for counselling, and for a missionary and pastoral task among doctors and nurses? Although some chaplains are full-time, many are already busy parish priests with little time for ward visiting.

Wickham has shown how the organization of the Church into parishes breaks down in an industrial area:[1] so it does in dealing with large hospitals. For large hospitals are communities on their own and the chaplain is the leader of "The-Church-in-the Hospital". This is an important conception because much writing and speaking about the Church's Ministry of Healing has led doctors to think that the chaplain is concerned primarily with para-normal healing. But he is the spearhead of the Church, the living Body of Christ: on his own he cannot even celebrate the Holy Communion. One of his tasks is to create a Christian community within the hospital which can undergird his own ministry with prayer, and deepen the spiritual content of the physical work done by doctors and nurses: or, if he is a part-time chaplain, his task is to link those to whom he ministers with the Christian community in his own parish through prayer, visiting and the eucharist. The Ministry of Healing is essentially a *corporate* activity. Teamwork within the hospital and within the parish, between priest and doctor, is an essential foundation to a unified Ministry of Healing.

Suggested Ways of Developing Doctor/Clergy Co-operation

(1) *A Department of Spiritual Medicine.* It has been suggested that a hospital should have a special department of spiritual medicine where patients with spiritual problems could be referred. Surely nothing—however convenient—should be done which might suggest that spiritual work can be separated out from the rest of the hospital work! For every department belongs to God and its daily work is his daily concern. Let pastors be seen in the wards, and not in an annexe to the Psychiatric Department. And let the work of doctors and nurses be known to be as holy as the chaplain's work, for all three have their pastoral opportunities and responsibilities. A good Christian sister on each ward would soon starve the department of spiritual medicine out of a job!

(2) *Doctor/Clergy Clinics.* There is increasing interest in setting up Doctor/Psychiatrist/Clergy clinics. It seems probable that such clinics will have a threefold value during the next twenty to fifty years. (*a*) They will slowly teach more patients that sometimes a parson is needed and not a doctor; (*b*) they will teach more doctors that spirit expresses itself in and through the material, and that the spiritual factor cannot be omitted from the healing task; and (*c*)

[1] *Church and People in an Industrial City*, p. 243 inter alia.

they will teach more clergy that the things which doctors and nurses do for patients are just as valid ways of mediating the love of God as so-called "religious" methods. There is immense value in treating many patients, especially certain types of mental patients, in their own family environment as out-patients. The advantages of a co-operative approach to therapy are obvious. But there is always the risk of regarding such clinics—and therefore regarding the spiritual factor in healing—as only suitable for certain types of case which must be "referred" for such therapy. Whereas the compassion of Jesus Christ in doctor, psychiatrist, and priest, both when working on their own or together, is the essence of real healing work, and the norm of Christian therapy.

If we were to remove the focus of doctor/clergy co-operation away from the places where most patients now go for treatment—the hospitals and the G.P. surgeries, it might not be so easy to get it back again. But it is to be hoped that the principles of co-operation, hammered out in practice, will become re-embedded in hospital life and in the training of doctors and priests to save/heal persons—back in the wards and out-patient departments where the daily battle to overcome sickness is fought. What is discovered in the special clinics must be transfused back into ordinary life.

(3) *Doctor/Clergy Groups.* The Guild of Health has been in touch with over twenty such groups, and from their programs and experience has produced a draft study outline[1] to help other groups plan their meetings. Both the Archbishops' Report[2] and the B.M.A. Report commend the work of such local groups. Their special task seems to be:

(*a*) To bring doctors and clergy into personal touch so that friendship may extend to co-operation over individual patients. The doctor/clergy clinics will carry this further than fireside discussion.
(*b*) To gain knowledge, in particular to discover a common understanding of such words as health, spirit, soul, psyche; to get to know what each profession is trying to do for sick people.
(*c*) To deepen respect for one another's profession and work.

Many groups seem to dry up after a period, and this may be because further understanding requires the active co-operation of its members in some common task for their patients. It is fatally easy to continue as we are: but a deeper, more costly commitment to our Lord is necessary in this work. It is not just our duty we are called to: unprofitable servants are two a penny. But it is a task over and above the usual to go out of our way to co-operate with one another. Doctor/clergy groups, though one possible way to co-operation between members, are not the fundamental answer to the problem of the relationship between Religion and Medicine. This answer lies in the medical schools and theological colleges. If a medical student can go through three years of training to heal without religion, he will not bother much with it afterwards. For religion must be encountered as a factor both in living and in heal-

[1] *Doctor/Clergy Study Outline,* Guild of Health, 1958 (Cyclostyled).
[2] *Archbishops' Report.* Paras 125 ff. *B.M.A. Report.* Paras 61–3.

ing, during the formative years of study and training. It is also all too easy for a doctor to keep religion and medicine in watertight compartments in his life. The challenge to integrate them must be presented to us when we are students. We welcome, therefore, the invitation of both the B.M.A. and Archbishops' Reports to the principals of theological colleges and the deans of medical schools to put before their students the purpose of doctor/clergy co-operation.[1] Although there is a great deal of Christian medical work done in this country, the medical schools generally remain indifferent to the work of the Church in the hospital as a factor in healing sick men and women. What practical way is open to overcome this?

(4) *A Mission within a Hospital.* Nothing which thinks of the Church's work in terms of single chaplains, nor in the kind of narrow terms in which the Ministry of Healing is often considered (e.g. merely as the recovery of a seventh sacrament or healing services) is likely to make any deep or lasting impression. Only a mission of the Church, to a particular local task, continued and deepened over the years, is likely to win the respect of doctors.

The key points in Medicine are the big teaching hospitals. If *one* such were chosen—either in London or, perhaps, Newcastle or Manchester—for a mission which would show Medicine what the Church's work among both sick and those who minister to them is really about; then such a pilot scheme would have wide repercussions both in Medicine and the Church. Wickham's mission in Sheffield has shown the value of continued deepening work over fifteen years in one place. And the lessons learned there by the Church are of more than local value.

The mission team would need both priests and ministers, doctors and sisters and members of professions associated with medicine, with real vocation, *special training*, and experience. They would be a working team, not withdrawn from their daily job, but forming the trained nucleus of the growing Body of Christ in that hospital. Although a working team, it is essential that by suitable timetable, numbers of staff, and arrangement of work, the team should have time for prayer, study, and thought together. Without this their special work would not be possible, namely the creation of a living Church within the community.

The mission would need to be ecumenical, with all churches working as a team. The place of priest/doctor, or deacon/doctor, and of men and women "religious" would need to be worked out. In addition to corporate worship and study, those special activities proper to the care of the sick would be developed—intercession group (drawing in doctors and nurses to pray for their patients), group therapy, and the training of lay sick visitors and after-care visitors. After fifteen to twenty years of missionary work—real pioneering, which was not afraid of trying new patterns, nor afraid of failure—Medicine would begin to see something which was important enough for medical students to hear about as a part of their

[1] *Archbishops' Report.* Para. 132. *B.M.A. Report.* Para. 53.

curriculum. But who knows exactly *what* would become visible? For a praying, caring, missionary body will save/heal not just the sick but the "healthy" too—and that is the good news of the Kingdom of God.

SUMMARY

(1) Medicine is confused over the meaning of "The Church's Ministry of Healing" because, for the most part, this work is seen in terms of chaplains, instead of in corporate terms of the Church-in-the-Hospital.

(2) Three suggested ways of Doctor/Clergy co-operation are considered: (*a*) A department of Spiritual Medicine; (*b*) Doctor/Clergy clinics; (*c*) Doctor/Clergy groups. None are the answer for the future.

(3) The relationship between the spiritual and material in healing must be taught in student days. It cannot be grafted on afterwards.

(4) A local "mission" is proposed within a teaching hospital, which over the years would yield fruits of importance for both Church and Medicine.

MICHAEL WILSON.

Albert Camus's Philosophy of Revolt

THE untimely death last January of Albert Camus—he was only forty-six—was a major loss alike to French literature and to European thought. Commonly regarded as an existentialist, he in many respects stood alone. Certainly he was no mere paladin of Sartre's, nor even an ally. Yet as an expression of what is most sensitive in the mid twentieth-century mind and mood there is no more representative or, I believe, encouraging figure. My aim in this article will therefore be less to assess Camus's standpoint than to explain it, so far as limited space allows. Indeed assessment would be premature; we are still too close to him.[1]

It is a philosophy which must be characterized, however awkwardly, as a doctrine of the *absurd*. Life doesn't make sense, because man and the world he inhabits are antithetic terms. The former, being rational, demands of course that life should make sense, since his reason is the very principle which impels him to expect it. On the other hand the fact of a world in which rational man suffers and dies reveals that "reality" does not cohere and that nothing has any ultimate meaning. He himself perforce remains an outsider. Take, for example, his need of morality: how does the world meet it? It does not; it is indifferent, even hostile. Yet man continues to "oppose the principle of justice within him to the principle of injustice

[1] Camus's success as a writer rests mainly on his novels, *The Outsider*, *The Plague* and *The Fall*, and his plays, *Caligula* and *Cross Purpose*. These, with *The Myth of Sisyphus*, have all been translated into English. The three volumes of *Actuelles* are so far available only in the original (Gallimard).

around him" in an effort to set up a "unitary reign of justice". Thus are we left with the spectacle of a being who, in seeking to comprehend, encounters only the incomprehensible—though abolish either term and nothing is left. That he cannot get rid of this absurdity is the scandal and shame of man's situation. *C'est le péché sans Dieu.*[1] If we ask why it should be so no answer at all can be given. Yet the question is insistent and itself a sign that we refuse to contemplate a meaningless world. It is Kant's difficulty over again. The Koenigsberg sage also saw that nature and the moral consciousness are at odds; but he went on to argue that the "practical" reason is bound to postulate God as the ultimate Unifier.

For Camus too it is man's will, not his intelligence, that bridges the gulf. Where he differs from Kant is in his conviction of what the will cannot do. He denies that there is any "practical" reason to help us out since reason *qua* reason is impotent; although it is equally true that "there is nothing beyond reason". No other course therefore is open to us than to base life on fortuity, so that the first principle of a new morality will be: To live is necessarily to live without reason. *Vivre, c'est vivre l'absurde.*[2] It is the ethic of Sisyphus in the ancient tale, condemned for ever to haul a boulder up a mountain-side, only to know that each time he nears the summit it will roll down again. He never can succeed, any more than you or I can cheat death. Let us then face the facts of our existence and not try to hide them behind a screen of scientific achievement or political hopes. The paths of glory—technological, social, intellectual—lead but to the same dusty end. Suicide, however, would not be a solution of our problem, nor can we merely sit and do nothing. Sisyphus' task remains our vocation. "The struggle itself towards the heights is enough to fill a man's heart." And, Camus adds, "one must imagine Sisyphus happy".

Man is therefore a creature of yes and no. He affirms life, however absurd; but the absurdity of it he refuses. Yet his revolt, though ineffectual, is by no means useless, since his reason itself compels him to it. If I rebel it is because I will not submit to an assault upon my integrity and intrinsic dignity as a rational being. Nor is rebellion self-centred; it is a protest on behalf of others, my fellows: "*I* rebel, therefore *we are*." For in others a man transcends himself and becomes truly creative: *La révolte est fabrication d'univers,*[3] and is not therefore a merely negative gesture. It is here that Camus's dissent from the existentialist *credo* becomes plainer. He maintains that there are values which in some sense are "objective"—the spontaneity of our rebellion surely proves it—and that "human nature" is a true datum. The impulse to rebel is in fact our virtue, the only road to self-discovery and self-definition.

The present age notoriously is an age "without God in the world". This Camus recognizes and accepts. As Nietzsche put it, God is dead; and as Hegel, Comte and Marx, as well as Nietzsche himself, saw, and

[1] *Le Mythe de Sisyphe* (1942), p. 40.
[2] Op. cit., p. 76.
[3] *L'Homme révolté*, p. 316.

in their differing ways prophesied, man is free at last to accept responsibility for himself; *his* kingdom at least has come, in reality and not simply as a promise. Certainly Camus is satisfied that God cannot be "proved"—not even, as Kierkegaard paradoxically believed, by a *sacrificium intellectus*; but his atheism essentially is moral, not intellectual; it is the idea of divine existence itself which must be rejected since it transcends that very reason in which man's only authentic advantage lies. Accordingly religious faith can be built neither upon reason nor upon non-reason. Moreover, what are we to understand by the vocable "God"? Christian theism itself distinguishes more than one line of thought. Deity may be conceived as an ultimate reality or principle; or as a personal Creator, the author of nature as we know it and therefore presumably of much of the tragedy of man's existence; or again as a sovereign Judge, supreme "elector" and disposer of men and events, who accepts one and abjures another. But though these conceptions differ in nature as doubtless in origin, Christian theology has always striven to unite them. And it is against this theological God that man rebels, in Camus's view rightly. Put it this way. If our rebellion frustrates God's purposes (among which we have to reckon the course of "hostile" nature), then he in turn is made to share our lot, which is perpetually one of frustration. Thus God and man are quits—which means that God has lost and is no more. But man has this reason at least to rejoice, that he cannot be man until at last God is vanquished, as well morally as intellectually.

To be a rebel is then his true condition, as Genesis itself shows—for Adam is simply Prometheus. The conflict between man's aspirations and his actual state is fundamental, since it is because of it that he is what he is. Christianity indeed has sought to resolve this conflict by means of its central doctrine of incarnation, in which God himself partakes of our suffering. "Only the sacrifice of an innocent God could justify the long and universal torture of innocence." If sorrow is at the heart of all things a strange kind of happiness may become possible.[1] But for modern man Christ has inevitably lost his divinity and with it his mediatorial power. Christianity's *via dolorosa* has therefore no further meaning. Man, alone now in the universe, must vindicate his own liberty.

In other words, he must himself become God. Faust's *Bin ich ein Gott?* gave indeed the hint and the modern mind has followed it. Yet does not Christianity itself imply almost as much in claiming that God has become man? For God became man, it teaches, in order that man might become God, Christ's resurrection from the dead signifying the undying life which man feels himself to possess. In Hegel's aphorism, "Death is transformed in the universality of Spirit as it embodies itself in the life of the community, every day of which is a dying and rising again." But as God may be variously conceived, so too may man's self-divinization. What kind of a deity is his to be? A progressive realization of an ideal of beneficence or a nihilistic

[1] Ibid., p. 53.

exploitation of power? For revolt may as readily take one form as another. In a century of unprecedented violence the Marquis de Sade has become a balefully symbolic figure. Yet Sade represents an affirmation of man's *absolute* freedom—freedom from all received values, freedom even from the restraints of nature: *J'abhorre la nature,* he wrote. When seen in this light the phenomenon of modern totalitarianism, in which "liberation" of the collectivity means enforced submission for the individual, may be understood for what it is. "The epoch that dares to call itself the most revolutionary offers us nothing but a choice of conformisms." Human beings are reduced to objects, quantities. Prometheus the liberator has become Caesar the enslaver.

It is a pessimistic answer, entailing a pessimistic view of history. Yet why should it seem pessimistic unless judged according to a scale of values that exist "outside" history? Modern man is caught up in a network of contradictions, since if history will not help him neither will a knowledge of the physical universe, which tells him nothing about how to live. In other words, his revolt is a refusal either to be treated merely as natural phenomenon or to be reduced to a "moment" in an unmeaning historical process; as Camus puts it, it is "bound to the promise of a value". For the No of rebellion to have any point or effectiveness it must somewhere be possible to say Yes. Hence man's inward division: there must be something within him that he cannot deny, cannot rebel against; for revolt is "a denial of one side of existence in the name of another side which it exalts". Failure to rebel therefore would be sin against himself. To repress, consistently and "scientifically", that within him which prompts him to rebel can result only in nihilism. He must strike out for freedom, yet equally his actions have to be controlled by that sense of values without which his humanity loses all definition. To devise a practicable humanism for our day we shall have to discover an ethic that is both "unsubmissive and loyal"—unsubmissive to our actual historical conditions and loyal to our demand for integration and reconciliation. Perhaps the clear light of the Mediterranean sun—Camus himself was an Algerian—may yet be able to teach our "nordic fogs" what the ancients so well understood—the necessity of measure and balance, even for the rebel. For authentic rebellion —"mother of forms, source of true life"—is itself a plea for measure and balance, holding us upright "in the mad, formless onrush of historical time."

Camus's thought thus turns on a dualism: history is opposed to value, flux to permanence. All the same, he warns us, we cannot simply take refuge in a Platonic heaven; our primary datum is life itself, in which fact and value meet in conflict, revealing the "absurdity" of our situation and the necessity of resolving it. Certainly no "absolute" can be produced out of the chaos of history by any simple option of Yes *or* No; for our humanity finds adequate expression only in the Yes *and* No of revolt against the double sterility of "pure" eternity and "pure" history. We reject both, that is, because each tends to divinize itself, whereas they alike draw their

meaning from that tension between time and eternity which we ourselves create. Man feels himself to be guilty because he is aware that whilst his values condemn his history he yet is unable to divest himself of either of them.

The intelligibility of revolt, as Camus sees it, now becomes plainer. In one aspect it is that which gives form to a life in search of measure and balance. Here man's achievements in art reveal what he is capable of. In particular the novel—characteristic witness to an age in rebellion—is a continuous protest against the appalling shapelessness of life. In another aspect—and again it is art which proves it—it is that wherein man discovers his natural creativity. Nihilism and destruction are foreign to his being. Our modern tyrants, products of a nihilistic revolution, can kill readily enough, but they cannot create; whereas artists, who too are rebels, know how to create but can never really kill.[1] Hence revolt, at its root, is an act of defiance on the part both of the moral and of the aesthetic consciousness: between an empty heaven and a future without hope it is the modern humanist's only possible reply. For a humanist Camus assuredly is. He has even been compared—unlikely though the comparison may at first glance appear—with E. M. Forster. "There is the same profound humanity in both writers, the same good sense and impatience with mysticism, the same basic optimism concerning men and scepticism as regards all ideologies."[2] Mr Forster, moreover, has always seemed to find humanity at its truest—least encumbered by portentousness, pretence and paradox—in the lands of the Mediterranean; and it is to the ancient wisdom of those lands that Camus, who saw nothing of the north until he was twenty-three, is authentically heir. He desired little else than that man, in the modest way of his daily round, should understand where the real sources of his strength still lie. Grandiose visions of a destiny to be achieved in terms of some "absolute" ideal are a delusive mirage. History, Camus believes, is never more than an "occasion"—a fleeting moment of which, like a good craftsman, man should seize the proffered opportunity. What he may make of it will serve him for a time only, but let him nevertheless put his best into it.

Camus liked to think of himself—his origins were working-class—as an artisan, a craftsman in letters (his mother, a charwoman, was illiterate); and for a son of France what higher vocation is there? The writer, he tells us, is both creator and redeemer. *Il crée la forme et le salut.*[3]

To criticize such a view—surely for 1960, we may think, naively romantic—is easy enough. What place has the mere *littérateur* in an age of automation and technocracy? Still more, what sense is there in his assuming the airs of a man of destiny? To which Camus himself might have replied—the words occur near the end of *The Rebel*:

[1] Ibid., p. 340.

[2] *Times Literary Supplement*, 8 January 1960, pp. 13 f.

[3] Ibid., p. 324. "Qu'est-ce que le roman, en effet, sinon cet univers où l'action trouve sa forme, où les mots de la fin sont prononcés, les êtres livrés aux êtres, où toute vie prend le visage du destin?"

"The secret of Europe is that it no longer loves life." As a man of his time he was acutely aware of every reason for being a pessimist. From much of what he wrote one could, if one chose to ignore the real core of his message, extract something verging on despair. Yet, he tells us, if men will but allow themselves to be men there is ever hope. "They knew now", he wrote in that little epic of suffering and injustice, *The Plague*, "that if there is one thing they can always yearn for, and sometimes attain, it is human love." Only let us not look for what in the nature of things cannot be found. Rebellion is necessary, but since it perpetually oscillates between being a protest of conscience and an expression of the *Angst* so characteristic of our time it is an *engagement sans issu*. Even as such, however, it can reveal our authenticity. It is therefore a philosophy; indeed, the only acceptable philosophy, as that of man's constant and deepening self-awareness.

The echoes of Heidegger are unmistakable. But though Camus decisively rejected any theistic solution of the human problem the drift of his thinking repeatedly raises theological issues. In face of the complacent secularism for which, despite the tragic aspect of the present century, popular democracy is by no means blameless, he reminds us of the scandal (if one may so put it) of both "election" and suffering; a scandal which Christian theism itself has sometimes been a little too prompt in explaining. There are lessons in fact which Christians may well learn from Camus's humanism. He never underestimates humanity, even though he sees it as wandering for ever in the boundless waste of an existence without meaning. There are moments, I think, when Camus's dialectic recalls Blondel, whose neo-Augustinianism is in the last resort an attempt to discover that plenitude of being—Augustine's *intimior mei*—somewhere concealed in all of us. But Camus, unlike the Catholic philosopher, has no metaphysic of being in which the contradictions and frustrations of human experience are resolved or released. Instead he leaves us only with a Manichaean antithesis of Good and Evil. However the attitude he bids us adopt is not tragical: his humour and irony exclude melodrama. After all we have life itself, and love, and the beauty of the visible world. There is no need to fancy ourselves impaled on the horns of some grandiose dilemma. When François Mauriac pressed him with the choice of "Marx or Christ" his reply was: "No. Some of us have to reject both the cries of hatred that come to us from the one side and the moving solicitations that come to us from the other. And we are seeking between the two for that just voice which will bring no truth without shame."

"Truth without shame": such was Camus's inner hope; truth without the disorder and violence, of one kind or of another, that unreasoning history forces upon us. Again and again we suppose it our mission to "remake" the world, to "recreate" humanity. But it is a snare, the voice of the devil. What matters is, not humanity but men. In conclusion, it is worth remembering perhaps that both Camus and Augustine were North Africans facing a not wholly dissimilar situation. The one witnessed the fall of Rome, as to-day the

other sees the decline of Europe. In both writers the sense of history is profound and portentous. But the saint believed that he knew whither history was tending and what it finally meant. The overthrow of temporal splendours itself gave birth to a keener hope. Camus, in a civilization vastly different, had no such assurance. History as he saw it is vanity and leads nowhere. Yet he remained an optimist, confident—if only by a margin—that our really fundamental values are not, so long as humanity lasts, too easily destructible.

B. M. G. Reardon.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Francis House is Associate General Secretary of the World Council of Churches.

The Rev. Paul Gibson is Rector of St George's, Hannon, in the diocese of Niagara.

Dr Wilson is the Chaplain of the Guild of Health.

The Rev. B. M. G. Reardon is Rector of Parham, Sussex.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

FEWER MISSIONARY SOCIETIES?

Dear Sir,

I think I agree with practically every word that your correspondent Mr Graham Dowell writes in criticism of my article "Fewer Missionary Societies?". Of course he is absolutely right in wanting to see an end to the strife and battle in the matter of ecclesiastical colour here and abroad.

We must have our idealists—bless them all!—but surely he will agree that we must have some realists as well. If he thinks that "deadly distinctions" have become largely irrelevant at home in the sense that they do not now exist, then I think he is wrong. The bitterness and the rivalry have largely gone, but the distinctions are still there and these are reflected in missionary giving, whether we like it or not.

It is because of this that my article deals with things as they are and suggests certain steps that might be taken immediately to ensure greater support for the missionary work of the Church and the grasping of the opportunities that now exist and cannot be met. The great thing is surely that the Gospel should be preached in all its fullness now.

Yours faithfully,
Michael Hocking.

St Ambrose Vicarage,
Bristol 5.

Dear Sir,

The article by Mr Hocking in your March issue advocating a reduction, even if a slight one, in the number of Anglican Missionary Societies must have rung one or two bells in the minds and hearts of a good many of us who have much to do with the missionary societies; it would seem to be part of a general re-assessment of the organization and structures of the Church of England which one notices being carried on in several quarters at the present time, not least under the influence of the stewardship campaign about which Mr Skelton wrote in the same issue. Nevertheless, his method of re-assessment, like that of the report "Growing Together", sticks exclusively to the practical aspects of the situation and so seems to me to cover only the final lap of the necessary ground. Thorough theological reflection, which one would hope for from a journal with your title is essential before the practical aspects can be tackled.

Three areas of discussion at least surely need theological exploration.

The first is about the place of that range of activities that have come to be known as "foreign missions" within the total purpose and organization of a church. This has received a good deal of discussion in recent years and I need not enlarge on it now.

The second question, which has at least begun to receive consideration, is the question of Church unity. The Anglican Church has long insisted on its character as both catholic and protestant, and has repeatedly put itself forward as a possible bridge between these two wings of the Christian Church as a whole, but surely in order to be a bridge it is essential that the two wings, and any other type of churchmanship which may be found between them, should indeed meet within the Anglican Church, and not be allowed to keep themselves apart from one another by the kind of sheerly expedient considerations which Mr Hocking adduces.

Mr Skelton too approaches on this question, but fails to deal with it when, as he considers the ever widening financial responsibilities of a local church, he completely leaves out of account its financial involvement in the Ecumenical Movement which brings together the different churches. It has become clear that the new orientation of church finances under the influence of stewardship schemes gives an extremely healthy perspective to Christians within the Church, but surely it is high time that this perspective embraced other churches within Christendom. Paul's collection for the Church in Jerusalem and Professor Cullmann's modern parallel remind us that it is when we give of our money to one another that we most surely grow together.

(I am not in possession of all the relevant facts, but from that section of the Ecumenical Movement which I do know, it would appear that the international imbalance in the sources of financial support of ecumenical organizations is giving rise to extremely serious spiritual, let alone political, problems.)

The third question, and one that has only just begun to be theo-

logically discussed, is the question of the voluntary society as over against a centralized and unified Church structure. I repeat that I am sure this needs *theological* discussion. For example, in Mr Hocking's article he quotes against centralization, from a letter from a member of one of the missionary societies, the argument of impersonality, which we are all too familiar with from captious criticisms of the Welfare State. This sort of argument nowadays just will not do. The Church is set in the world to be an example to the world in every way, and not least in its forms and structures. Large scale centralizations, whether in Government, commerce or Church, are demanded by the present situation and our task as Christians is surely not merely to hark back to what has previously been the case, but so to organize *our* large scale structures that they will in fact show the world how this type of structure can be a foretaste of the undoubtedly larger scale organization of that Kingdom of Heaven for whose advent on earth we daily pray.

But this is perhaps to come down too quickly on one side of a question that has not yet received adequate discussion. The Anglican Church is the only one in this country which in fact retains the voluntary society principle; in British life as a whole, too, this principle, for all its distinguished history, seems to be being squeezed out by present developments. The North American churches have entirely given it up. Exactly how important is it, and why? This is what we should be discussing, not minor adjustments in the prevailing situation.

One last, and not unrelated point, arising from Mr Smart's article on the narrowness of contemporary British theology. Is it not the case that this narrowness has arisen because of the insularity of British theology particularly in the syllabuses of theological faculties in the universities, an insularity that stultifies precisely those subjects which the missionary societies have within their compass? The teaching of Church history seems to be confined almost exclusively to this end of the world, as does the teaching of the philosophy of religion. If the missionary societies and theological faculties could be encouraged to fertilize one another far more than seems to have been the case recently, would not that narrowness, which Mr Smart so rightly complains of, in time disappear?

Yours faithfully,
MARTIN CONWAY.
International Secretary.

STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT,
ANNANDALE,
NORTH END ROAD,
LONDON, N.W.11.

THE CHRISTIAN LEFT STILL LOST

DEAR SIR,

As one who began his Christian Socialist career by joining the Guild of St Matthew at the age of twenty (the Guild died

soon afterwards!) I thank Canon Preston for his article under the above heading, which I hope will provoke its "Christian Left" readers, myself included, to some fresh thinking. But I must protest against his statement that "few ideas have proved more erroneous than the illusions about the Soviet Union held by Conrad Noel and those influenced by him". To what alleged "illusions" does he refer? I knew Conrad Noel intimately for very many years (which included the twenty-five years which elapsed between the Russian Revolution and his death in 1942), and I can assure Canon Preston that if he thinks that Noel saw everything in the Soviet garden as lovely and nothing as unlovely, then he himself is suffering from an illusion. Noel did see some good things in the Soviet regime (would Canon Preston deny that there were and are *any* good things in it?), but he also saw some bad things in it, and said so. It is true that a few of "those influenced by him" did come to offer undiscriminating worship to the Soviet Union, supporting every feature of it and everything that its rulers did; but he criticized them adversely for doing this—and they criticized him adversely for *not* doing it!

It is perhaps significant that the Red Flag which Conrad Noel hung in Thaxted Church was inscribed, not with the Hammer and Sickle, but with the words "He hath made of one blood all nations". In these days of colour bars and apartheid I suggest that Canon Preston might well follow his example by using his influence to get such a flag hung in Manchester Cathedral.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT WOODIFIELD.

3 GILLING COURT,
BELSIZE GROVE, N.W.3.

Canon Preston writes: "I am most interested in Mr Woodifield's letter. I agree that there were and are good things in the Soviet Union, and I am quite opposed to mere anti-communism or anti-sovietism. I do not think that Conrad Noel was totally uncritical of the Soviet Union, and perhaps I should have made clear that many of his followers were more uncritical than he. But I do not think he was critical enough. Many of us fell into the same error."

THE GOSPEL LECTION IN THE RITE OF INFANT BAPTISM

DEAR SIR,

Mr Pocknee, in his letter in the April number of THEOLOGY (p. 158 f.) has not answered Lady Oppenheimer's point in the February number (p. 67 f.). She queried the use of Matt. 28. 18–20 as the lection at Infant Baptism, on the ground that it was not an authentic saying of Jesus: he replies that the longer text in Matt. 28. 19 is original. But all he has shown is that it is an original part of Matthew's gospel, not that it is an authentic saying of Jesus; unless when he says ". . . We may conclude that the *consensus fidelium* of historic and catholic Christianity has authenticated this

passage", he means, "If enough people say that A said X, then A said X". And if that is what he means, then he is using a form of the argument from tradition which many of us would find impossible —and which many of the *fideles* have renounced for a century and more.

Yours *fideliter*,
JOHN C. FENTON.

THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE,
LICHFIELD.

The Rev. C. E. Pocknee writes: "The fact that for a century or more higher criticism has sought by various means to get rid of inconvenient passages in Holy Scripture proves nothing, unless it is the unreliability of such criticism. For the tergiversations of the critics in such matters are notorious.

"It is this claim to possess recondite and esoteric knowledge on the part of the higher critics which mystifies and dismays ordinary people who believe the New Testament to contain the words of Jesus. By the same kind of argument the critics have sought to discredit the institution of the Holy Communion by Christ and its perpetuation by his Church.

"How does Mr Fenton determine what are the *ipsissima verba* of Christ? Why should the words in Matt. 28. 18–20 be less authentic than those in any other part of the Gospel? In fact your correspondent seems to have made the *a priori* assumption that they are *not* authentic in order to prove his case.

"The Church which gives Mr Fenton his orders as a priest and minister cites this pasage in the Office of Holy Baptism as the warrant for what it does in the name of Christ; and in so doing accepts the words as authentic. As the Principal of a Theological College of the Church of England as well as a Clerk in Holy Orders, your correspondent is called upon to teach what the Church of England authorizes him to teach, rather than his own opinions about the sacraments based upon the unproven assumptions of *a priori* reasoning."

ELDERS

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

Although not an Anglican, I am a regular reader of your magazine—an Elder of the Church of Scotland—and I shall try to answer the questions asked by Mr Battersby in your issue of February.

In the Church of Scotland our congregations are governed by the Kirk Session. The Kirk Session consists of elders and their moderator, the minister. The elders are ordained to the office (or inducted if they have already been ordained elsewhere). Women are ineligible as elders. The session cannot act without their own minister as moderator, or if he is absent some reverend substitute. The minister alone is responsible (subject to the law of the Church) for modes of worship. Every Kirk Session sends an elder as a member of the presby-

tery in which the congregation is situated. A minister (not the moderator) may be a member of the Kirk Session if he is a member of the congregation, the higher office including the lower.

At the General Assembly every minister who is a member of Assembly is accompanied by one or two of his Kirk Session as member or members of Assembly also.

Besides sitting in session the elder has pastoral duties. He visits the members of the congregation in the district which is allotted to him and at the celebration of Holy Communion he bears the vessels from the Holy Table to the communicants. This duty was not originally imposed on elders but it is based on long consuetude.

Yours faithfully,

16 Walker Street,
Edinburgh, 3.

C. F. M. Maclachlan.

BOOK REVIEWS

Man in Community. By Russell Philip Shedd. Epworth Press. 30s.

Jung and St Paul. By David Cox. Longmans. 32s.

Christianity according to St Paul. Mowbrays. 3s. 6d.

Man in Community is the product of research at the University of Edinburgh by a young American Baptist now working in Portugal. Dr Shedd rightly observes in his preface that "there is no specific comprehensive treatment of St Paul's doctrines of human solidarity in relationship to their background". He has now supplied the deficiency with a study that is certainly comprehensive, painstaking and well-documented, if not very stimulating. His extensive and unprejudiced reading in the current literature assorts somewhat oddly with a decidedly conservative attitude to critical questions; the fourth gospel is treated (though unobtrusively) as good authority for the personal teaching of Jesus, while for that of Paul he is prepared to draw indiscriminately on all the letters that appear under his name. This leads at one point to the unusual position that the Bride as an image of the Church is, in Pauline thought, prior to the Body. His general conclusion is that St Paul's thinking on this subject is exclusively Hebraic in its background, resting on Jewish conceptions of the solidarity of the race; and his tendency, as against Schweitzer and the Bishop of Woolwich, is to play down the quasi-physical aspect of the unity of Christians with Christ. When he comes to discuss the part played in this by the sacraments, the author's own theological background gets the better of his impartiality; the kind of sacramentalism of which he is so anxious to acquit St Paul, that which sets a value on a sacrament "merely as a rite", is one which no informed sacramental theologian would recognize, while his contrary emphasis on faith as "the paramount factor" and his opposition of "covenantal" and "sacramental" are in this context hardly less misleading. It really is an unprofitable exercise, and one quite unbecoming to the ecumenical aspirations of Dr Shedd's preface, to

approach St Paul from the entrenched positions of the sixteenth century. But, with these reservations, the student will find the book valuable both as a summary of the Pauline doctrine and as a quarry for further reading.

Jung and St Paul is an exercise in a very different key; it undertakes a comparison of St Paul's thought with that of a significant contributor to the outlook of the twentieth century. Mr Cox is not directly concerned to show either that St Paul anticipated Jung by nineteen centuries or that Jung vindicates St Paul for the modern world, but only that they operate, with their different presuppositions, on the same territory. He sees an analogy between individuation and justification, between the opposition of conscious and unconscious in Jung and the bondage of sin in Paul, between the Jungian concept of the self and the Pauline doctrine of the Christ, and finds the two systems sufficiently comparable for the contrast between them to be an illuminating one; as he expresses it, "one claims that what we think good is really evil, and the other that what we think evil is really good". Besides this gift for the epigrammatic summary, he brings to his formidable task notable expository ability, and a critical rigour learned from the discipline of linguistic analysis; his book is logically planned and admirably signposted.

Though not qualified to pass judgment on him as an interpreter of Jung, I am encouraged by the ample evidence of systematic study of Jung's own writings, by his emphasis on their Kantian background, by his careful subordination of Jung the speculative thinker to Jung the analyst, and by his steadily critical attitude to Jung's generalizations on the subject of religion. The Pauline side of the comparison is not always so satisfying. So long as he sticks to the text of St Paul the statement in the blurb that he brings to it "an undeniable and original gift of exegesis" is not unjustified, especially as applied to his analysis of the apostle's account of the bondage of sin in Romans. But elsewhere he prefers to approach Paul through his commentators, and this is particularly true of his chapter on justification, which, since he compares it with Jung's individuation, is crucial to his argument. He succeeds by a brilliant piece of destructive criticism in convicting the bulk of the commentators (especially English ones, who would do well to take it to heart) of inconsistencies, faulty definitions, or rhetorical camouflage; but this is not followed up by a direct examination of Paul's own arguments. Though strong on linguistic analysis, he is comparatively weak on philology—else he could hardly have distinguished "just" and "righteous" as if Paul used different words for them: nor concluded that faith in the context of justification is primarily *intellectual* belief (pp. 92–7). and then said further on that πίστις really means "trustful loyalty" (p. 243): nor maintained that penitence—not a characteristic Pauline word, and principally employed by those New Testament writers who do not speak of justification—and not, in some sense, faith, is the condition of justification in the Pauline account of it. Not a little of his main argument stems from this last conclusion.

Mr Cox thus offers unnecessary targets to the specialists; his penetrating positive contributions ought not on that score to be discounted. Particularly valuable (and relevant to recent discussion in THEOLOGY) is the way in which he brings his psychological insights to bear on the doctrine of original sin, of human solidarity in it and Christ's freedom from it; and he puts his finger neatly on the psychological flaw in the position of Pelagius. *Obiter dicta* of this kind would by themselves make the book worth reading, even if its main argument were negligible—which is very far from being the case.

Christianity according to St Paul is a series of sermons preached in Pusey House Chapel, and well illustrates the difficulties that attend the unamended reproduction of the spoken word in print. Those whose devotions are helped by the reading of homiletic material will derive most from Hugh Montefiore, Austin Farrer and C. P. M. Jones. Some of the others were really too slight for publication.

HUMPHREY GREEN.

KING'S COLLEGE,
LONDON.

CONFLICT AND AGREEMENT IN THE CHURCH; VOL. I, ORDER AND DISORDER. By T. F. Torrance. Lutterworth Press. 45s.

CHURCH AND SACRAMENTS IN DIVIDED CHRISTENDOM. By Leonard Hodgson. S.P.C.K. 1s. 9d.

Professor Torrance's book is the first volume of his collected essays on ecumenical subjects, the companion, which is shortly to follow, being on Ministry and Sacraments. Most of the essays have been published before in various journals, or communicated to audiences in lectures and addresses. It is unlikely, however, that any reader would have previous acquaintance with all of them, and even the specialist who follows almost everything that Dr Torrance writes on these subjects will find it a convenience to have all these substantial and important writings between two covers and properly indexed.

The book is one that demands the closest attention from any theologian who interests himself in the field of Faith and Order, and since this field now coincides with the major doctrines of the faith, it is not too much to say that no one who is interested in the proper formulation of these doctrines in our time can afford to neglect it. For the non-specialist it may involve a severer mental discipline than many are able to bring to it. To read this kind of theology with only the preparation that an Anglican theological education affords may be not unlike trying to listen to Schoenberg when one has been brought up on the composers of the nineteenth century. But, as in the musical case, the theology becomes lucid if one is prepared to give oneself to it with the attention and concentration it demands and deserves, and then it becomes plain that something of the highest importance is being said.

Theology of this degree of professionalism commands from an Anglican both respect and envy. Beyond doubt the discipline that has brought Professor Torrance's gifts to their present development is the study of the dogmatic and exegetical work of Calvin and Barth. We are accustomed to glory in the fact that our tradition has not been shaped by any such giants, but without them, or without some artificially created equivalent in the shape of masters chosen from outside our own tradition, we cannot match Reformed theology when we meet it in ecumenical discussion. The only comparable training now available to an Anglican, and that only to a very few, is prolonged participation in just such ecumenical debate.

Clearly it would be an impertinence to offer detailed critical comment on work of this order within the limits of a short review. It may be remarked, however, that Professor Torrance's thought shows an interesting development within the span of the work recorded in this volume. For him, as for many others, the turning-point seems to have been the much under-valued Lund. From that point on he turns, on the whole, from speaking polemically in the name of Reformed theology, to the task of stating the one faith in company with colleagues trained in other traditions. He ceases to be merely a confessional theologian, and becomes an ecumenical one. Thus, instead of continuing to offer to Anglican thought the drastic challenge of, e.g. the review of *The Apostolic Ministry*, we find in the most recently written essays that he has learned to say in his own way things that we had always wanted to say to him.

Perhaps the most substantial and rewarding of these papers are the Stumpff Lecture on the Atonement and the Oneness of the Church, and the long draft, now made public for the first time, of the working paper for the Faith and Order section at Evanston. The latter should be compared with the final outcome of the process in the Evanston Report. The comparison may leave one with enhanced respect for Dr Torrance, though one quite sees why his paper would not have done, and less for group discussion. At any rate, the severe criticism the Evanston paper has received from a number of Anglicans would have been much modified if they had been dealing with Torrance's formulation. The only papers one wishes he had omitted are the *Scotsman* correspondence with Fr Quinn, S.J., a skilled debater who perhaps has the best of it dialectically, though not on the historical issue, in a correspondence by which I hope neither will be remembered.

Dr Hodgson's booklet is aimed at a different audience, and is intentionally on a much slighter level. It too very characteristically displays its author's well-known abilities and methods, and doubtless fulfilled admirably the purpose for which it was composed. It is noticeable that however characteristically these two ecumenically-minded publications, the one Reformed, the other Anglican, differ, they have in common a plea for reciprocal, though not indiscriminate, intercommunion. It is time that we thought out our position in this matter far more theologically than we have hitherto done. The familiar position, however much refined by successive Lambeths,

evidently carries less and less conviction to those who are continuously engaged with the problem through participation in the ecumenical movement.

William Nicholls.

Edinburgh.

Christian Baptism. Edited by A. Gilmore. Lutterworth Press. 1959. 27s. 6d.

This group of essays by ten "younger British Baptist ministers", with an introductory chapter by Dr E. A. Payne, is to be welcomed by many outside the Baptist communion. Their studies are original and constructive. Critical at times of Baptist thought and practice, the authors have succeeded in making a genuine "contribution to the ecumenical debate". Dr Payne explains how Baptists, hitherto hesitant, have become willing to enter this field of discussion. Perhaps inevitably, he detects in the positions of paedo-baptist writers, on both sides of the current Anglican debate in particular, evidence in favour of Baptist conclusions. But the ecumenical spirit is maintained, and nowhere more surely than in this introductory chapter and in the concluding theological essay by the Rev. Neville Clark.

A concept of doctrinal development in harmony with the criterion of *sola scriptura* is worked out in Chapter 2, providing the groundwork for what follows and not least for Mr Clark's sober and well-balanced conclusions at the end. A chapter on Jewish antecedents removes a number of common misconceptions and reveals the proper distinctions and relations involved. There is a challenging critique of facile comparisons between circumcision and baptism, largely justified, though the contrast is too sharply drawn. Not all will agree with the precise analogy between Christian baptism and John's baptism in the matter of personal moral decision as a precondition of the rite. Otherwise there is much of value here. A useful section on prophetic symbolism is included.

In the first section of a long chapter on New Testament evidence apportioned between several contributors, a stimulating fresh approach is made to the accounts of Jesus' baptism and the nature of the issues raised. Familiar and long-standing interpretations of our Lord's words in the Synoptics about children and childlikeness are called in question, in a manner which to-day may command widespread agreement among those who cannot accept the main argument. A careful investigation of Acts passages, mainly involving the relation of Spirit-baptism to water-baptism, has its shaky moments as most parallel investigations have had, and like some of these is vitiated by the assumption that the effects of a sacrament have a simple temporal connexion with its performance. The exegesis of Pauline passages is illuminating and often convincing. But what is said about Rom. 6. 4 and 5 could without difficulty provide grounds for attributing resurrection-status quite properly to a baptized infant. And the "holiness" of 1 Cor. 7. 14 could be deemed to denote a condition so prone to the development of the grace-faith relationship, that the Church must say of the child of Christian parents,

"What doth hinder him from being baptized?" The authors show every concern for such children, short of this conclusion. After a somewhat fruitless search for evidence from St John, whose references are found to be too "allusive", the chapter concludes with interesting comments on 1 Peter and Hebrews arising out of recent research. In regard to the main argument, however, these cannot be said to reveal more than a *de facto* situation in which adult baptism was the norm.

Few will be disposed to quarrel with the analysis given in Chapter 5 of the causes of the spread of infant baptism in the early Church. But there is an obvious failure to account, on the presuppositions of these authors, for the notable difference (which they quite honestly acknowledge) between Tertullian and his admirer Cyprian, or the still more remarkable development in Origen's views from the Alexandrian to the Caesarean period. And on the basis of Chapter 2 it is hard on Chrysostom that he should be expected to disapprove infant baptism on the analogy of circumcision.

The two chapters on the later history are the fruit of solid research. The heroism of the early anti-paedobaptists of the Reformation period elicits admiration, and the ability of many of their leaders is put beyond question. Obloquy is silenced. Sidelights include the derivation of English Unitarianism from the Polish anti-Trinitarian Anabaptists. It is a noteworthy judgment that "for the Baptists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the greatest problem lay in the relation between baptism and the doctrine of the Holy Spirit".

In view of recent discussion in other circles we may conclude by remarking that all parties to the debate would do well to ponder long and deep on the implications of the statement "that the inward Grace and virtue of baptism is not tyed to that very moment of time wherein it is administered, and that the fruit and power thereof reacheth to the whole course of our life" (p. 281, citation from the Puritan "Directory for the Publique Worship of God", 1644).

Small errors include spelling mistakes: p. 210, l. 31; p. 224, l. 19; p. 286, three lines from the bottom; p. 311, l. 21; and possibly also p. 227, l. 30 and p. 249, l. 16. Awkward grammar, etc.: p. 32, l. 20 ff.; p. 232, l. 16; p. 252, l. 30 ff.; p. 266, l. 3 ff.; possibly p. 269, l. 31; p. 295, l. 12 ff.; p. 299, l. 30 ff.; and p. 309, l. 12 ff. Repetition: ref. to Oesterley and Box, pp. 70, 78.

Lower Peover Vicarage,
Knutsford.

John C. Sladden.

Out of Every Nation. By R. K. Orchard. S.C.M. Press. 1959. 5s.

The Gospel and Renascent Hinduism. By P. D. Devanandan. S.C.M. Press. 1959. 5s.

Asia looks at Western Christianity. By Thomas Ohm. Nelson. 1959. 25s.

There was a time when missionary work seemed a very simple affair. We are Christians, we live in a Christian country: millions of

souls live in the darkness of paganism. Let us go and save them. As the result of what was admittedly a generous instinct the work of modern missions began, preceded in time by those of the Roman Catholic Church, and the result has been what is commonly called the "Younger Churches". But the danger of this simple approach was to forget that "souls" are embodied and that the Church cannot afford to neglect or to ignore the social, cultural and political factors. All these books deal with some aspect of this problem.

Mr Orchard discusses the delicate question of the internationalizing of Missions. With the emergence of Churches, fully organized and often wider than one Western denomination, can the old autonomy of the "Mission" and the missionary society continue? Who are to be the agents of the Church's mission in Asia and Africa? Foreigners or nationals? And how will a "national church" retain the ecumenical character of the Church? It is clear that ecumenism involves much more than a relation of denominations or a restoration of a purely ecclesiastical unity. As Dr Devanandan says, "evangelistic work is not the specialized activity of an organized corps of paid professionals but the normal concern of every Christian in all walks of life, which finds natural expression in all human relations in which the Christian is involved . . . the propagation of the Christian faith is not to be confused with any vain desire of the Christian community for quantitative growth by merely expanding in geographical extent and numerical strength at the expense of other religious groups, but the committed endeavour of a sincerely religious people to further God's concern for the World of his making". But in this task the Church is confronted with new problems.

We can no more regard the Western world as "Christendom". Fr Ohm in his book shows how critical Asia is becoming in regard to the West and both he and Dr Devanandan show that the too close association of the Christian enterprise in Asia with the former imperial powers can be dangerously misunderstood.

The religions of Asia are on the move and Devanandan admirably describes the new life of Hinduism in relation to social changes and rapid movement of society in India. This small pamphlet is one of the best introductions to this subject that has been written, much to be recommended. The larger book aims at painting a canvas to cover the whole continent and has rather more to say about Japan. Written originally in German and published in 1948 it now appears in a not very happy translation, containing a good many misprints (a serious one on p. 203 where a book of Parekh is attributed to a distinguished diplomat, Pannikar) and already somewhat dated. An attempt to cover all Asia involves a rambling and very diffuse treatment of the subject. Yet this book is also valuable. Both remind us that the non-Christian religions are highly critical of what the West has made of Christianity while they themselves are being melted and reformed in the crucible of modern life. In the process of dialogue, we may have to learn as well as to teach.

As Dr Devanandan says, "the contemporary trend in Indian life which is expressed in the 'dan' (gift) movement with its emphasis

on the five gifts of land, labour, wealth, intellect and life, is an object lesson and a condemnation of the witness of local congregations of Christians in India. We stand to gain by reclaiming the Sarvodaya ideal of 'dan yagna' (gift sacrifice) which after all is founded on the fundamental Christian concept of stewardship of possessions in all forms. . . ."

We strongly recommend all these books to those concerned both with missionary strategy and missionary education.

LEONARD M. SCHIFF.

ST AUGUSTINE'S COLLEGE,
CANTERBURY.

MAGIC AND RELIGION. By George B. Vetter. Vision Press. 1959. 50s.

The title of this book is rather misleading. It is not a detailed discussion of the relations of magic and religion, as might be supposed, but a treatise on the psychology of religion generally. Only fifty pages out of five hundred and twenty are devoted specifically to magic and religion.

The author approaches his task from the standpoint of Behaviourism, or, in other words, deterministic materialism. In his eyes the chief enemy of a sound psychology is animism in any shape or form; and he devotes the longest chapter in the book to an examination of this question. Here is the heart of the book. Mr Vetter goes in great detail into the question of the formation of habits. Mind and consciousness, according to him, are no more than words and they exert no influence upon conduct. He writes: "It would seem, then, that a concept like 'will' had better join terms and expressions like 'sunrise' and 'sunset' into the limbo of common sense expressions useful enough for a certain shorthand of communication but simply not to be confused with scientific accounts of the processes involved." Consequently, "religion"—whatever that may mean, and the author finds himself unable even to make an attempt to define this (to him) hazy concept—is merely a habit, like any other form of human behaviour. Mr Vetter gives an ingenious explanation of the way in which he thinks a child comes to believe in prayer.

Thus religious belief, religious experience in every form, mysticism and the rest are "debunked". They are nothing but habits, and bad habits at that. They are not pathways to reality but blind alleys. The only explanation of such forms of behaviour is the scientific explanation: that is to say, the explanation which is capable of verification by observation and experiment. In what is perhaps an unguarded moment, however, the author says: "Each new discovery convinces the materialist that deterministic answers will ultimately be found to all the questions now in sight." He thus tacitly admits that Behaviourism is ultimately a matter of faith, and, in fact, is a dogma, comparable in that respect to the dogmas of religion.

Waiving this consideration, however, the author in his rejection of teleology and his sole reliance upon efficient causation falls into

the confusion of thought which was exposed once for all by Plato in the *Phaedo*, viz. the confusion between causes and reasons. If the only valid kind of explanation is that of the materialist-determinist, this is self-stultifying: for, *ex hypothesi*, all explanations must be equally true (or false) since they are all alike determined.

The truth of the matter is that in the mind of the author there is a great gulf fixed. On the one side stands the scientific psychologist, rigidly eschewing the concepts of consciousness and teleology and refusing to accept any evidence that cannot be established by strict scientific measurement and experiment. On the other side stands the preacher of the Gospel of Science, which must be acknowledged (he claims) as the source of all the best things in man's inheritance, even as what he calls "contranaturalism" has been the source of the worst. Yet apparently the writer is unaware of this deep inconsistency which underlies all that he has said in this book.

LINDSAY DEWAR.

MUCH HADHAM.

SHORTER NOTICES

THE SON'S COURSE. By Gerald Vann, O.P. Collins. 2s. 6d.

The Son is our Lord Jesus Christ. Extracts from Fr Vann's previous works form the bulk of the book. It is full of wise guidance, but chiefly for the more mature Christian. The tyro would find much of it beyond his grasp. It would be highly suitable for Lenten reading. Written for Roman Catholics, there are some passages which seem strange to an Anglican, if not unacceptable. Fr Vann has a penetrating knowledge of human nature and gives sound advice accordingly. "Being good essentially means learning God and loving God." He has a chapter on the problem of pain, the solution of which, he maintains, can be found only in the "divinity of Christ" and in the "tears of God". By becoming man "Christ could share in the suffering and thereby could reveal to us the richness of reality and the deep mystery of love". The author throws more light on this subject in his chapter on the Sorrow of God. He agrees with Thibault's remark about "God's Cross" as against Abelard who voiced a theological doubt whether God the Father, to whom we attribute perfection, could suffer. His thoughts on the Holy Trinity are worthy of study. Although the doctrine appears so theoretical "it is really the most practical thing on earth because it shows us that God, the absolute, infinitely removed from the nothingness of creatures, is yet not unattainable. In God there is family life, and into His home He invites us" and thus we become "partakers of the Divine nature".

O. J. HOGARTH.

PIETERMARITZBURG.

ELEMENTS OF HEBREW by an Inductive Method.
INTRODUCTORY HEBREW. Method and Manual.

Both by W. R. Harper, revised by J. M. Powis Smith. University of Chicago Press. 1959. (No price indicated for the first, the second $1.75.)

These two books are reprints of works originally published in their present form in 1921. The first contains an outline of Hebrew grammar, in places rather more detailed than Davidson, and not infrequently lacking the clarity possessed by that often unsatisfactory standard grammar. Some of the terminology and the transliteration are unfamiliar. The second contains fifty-six lessons, which lead the reader through every word of Genesis 1–8, with cross references to the *Elements*. It also has the full text of these chapters, and the unpointed text and a literal translation of 1–4. It concludes with some word frequency lists which have recently also been issued in a revised and corrected form by J. D. W. Watts (Brill, 1959).

An introduction by R. A. Bowman suggests that, though further revision might usefully have been undertaken, "there is no serious obstacle" to their use as now reproduced. Yet while no doubt many have profitably learned Hebrew from these text-books—and the method of learning grammar while reading a text may do much to make the language live—it is difficult to avoid the feeling that the presentation is rather outmoded.

PETER R. ACKROYD.

CAMBRIDGE.

THE HISTORY OF BELMONT ABBEY. By Basil Whelan, O.S.B. Bloomsbury Publishing Company. 1959. 25s.

This is a charming record of the Benedictine Community of St Michael's, Belmont, from its inception before the Roman Catholic hierarchy had been set up in England down to the present day. Often the book reads like an affectionate account of the "Old School" by an old boy, with many pen portraits of boys and staff. There are some interesting sidelights on the lives of Benedictine monks trained almost exclusively for the "Mission" and little different in their way of life from their secular counterparts in the parishes. It was Mr Webb-Prosser, the lay founder and generous benefactor of Belmont, who insisted on plain-chant as opposed to the florid music in vogue and highly favoured by the Benedictines. We read of one setting for the Creed which concluded with the singing of seventy-two Amens. In effect, Belmont became the model and the leader of best monastic plain-chant at one period of the history.

However, the most interesting factor to a student of Benedictine history is to see the working out in a single community of the principles of Benedictine monachism as shown in Hubert van Zeller's recent book, *The Benedictine Idea*. In view of the many difficulties and special circumstances, this did not take place fully until Belmont was created an Abbey in 1920; but there were in every generation

far-sighted individuals working to this end. That Rome, not always appreciating the local conditions, made mistakes is admitted and that recourse to Rome led to delay is natural; but by and large the result was beneficial to the whole English Benedictine congregation.

Bute Street, Cardiff Docks. B. M. Oman, O.G.S.

What is Philosophy? By Martin Heidegger. Vision Press. 25s.

The question which forms the title of this book is a question of a special kind. It is at the same time a question about philosophy and a genuinely philosophical question. Heidegger argues that it is only when treated in the second way that it will lead into a discussion of real profundity and goes on from that point to develop the idea of the necessity of a total involvement in the work of philosophy—or, in the language of the book itself, an attuned correspondence to the Being of being. It is a useful introduction to the basic character of Heidegger's thought, but it does not take us very far along the road.

The work is in fact a single lecture, first delivered in August 1955. The German text is given on one side of the page with an English translation on the other. The translators say that this is intended only as a vehicle for the comprehension of the German text. In this they are generally successful, though the English is sometimes unnecessarily awkward and there are a few mistakes. But the primary criticism of all must be the price; the book including introduction and both German and English texts amounts only to ninety small-sized pages, and for this we are asked to pay 25s.

Clare College, Cambridge. M. F. Wiles.

God and the Universe. Mowbray. 4s. 6d.

Prophets for our World. Mowbray. 4s. 6d.

Why Christ. By B. C. Butler. Darton, Longman and Todd. 10s. 6d.

Friendship with God. By Eric G. Day. Mowbray. 5s.

This is Life. By A Religious of C.S.M.V. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

The single aim of these five books is to commend the Christian Faith to this generation. *God and the Universe* and *Prophets for our World* are courses of sermons delivered to undergraduates in Pusey House Chapel and St Aldate's Church respectively. *God and the Universe* first examines the evidence for God in the world around and in human nature; then the self-disclosure of God in the prophets, in our Lord, and now in Holy Scripture and the Spirit. A final splendid chapter urges the necessity of making up one's mind on the evidence and launching out on the adventure of faith. The tone is set in the first address: "Unbelievers are not made by asking too many questions, but, often, by not questioning enough or ques-

tioning deeply enough." Here some of the right, disturbing questions are asked and answered with wisdom lightened with gaiety. The Pusey House congregation must have enjoyed the treat offered to them hugely, and been stimulated to think. It is significant that the Principal of Ridley Hall was invited to preach at Pusey House; no less, that at St Aldate's Jonah, Daniel, and 2 Isaiah were put into the places assigned to them by most biblical scholars to-day. The barriers are crumbling. *Prophets for our World* shows the abiding value of the revelation of God in the books of Job and of the prophets, and its relevance to the present times. There are signs of strain here and there due to the shaping of the preacher's inspiration to the demands of a set plan; but if this book sends its readers back to study of the Old Testament, it will serve a good purpose. Professor C. A. Coulson contributes a final chapter urging the Christian community to be courageous in facing and accepting new knowledge. At Oxford high and low seem to be doing so.

In *Why Christ* the Abbot of Downside takes a space-rocket view of the human situation. He sees modern Man groping, perplexed, in a world of shadows; without purpose because he lacks faith or vision. The lamp to illuminate his path is love. Love is the golden thread running through the book. Human love requires as its source and full satisfaction that Love which is God. Divine Love pours out himself in revelation, in Jesus Christ, in the Catholic Church in order to win our love and give us vision and a purpose in life. It is an appealing theme unfolded with sweet reasonableness and absence of polemics.

Dr Jay's *Friendship with God* is subtitled the Way of the Anglican Communion, which sets its aim. It is an outline of middle-of-the-road Anglican faith and practice suitable to be placed in the hands of inquirers and confirmation candidates. Theological terms are explained simply, though, strangely, there is no explanation of the meaning of "sacrifice" as it was understood in biblical times. Readers will be inclined to give to the word, every time it occurs, its modern eviscerated significance. The first chapter expounds the teleological argument for the existence of God, and from there the theme of Purpose runs through the book. It is God's purpose that we should be his friends: the Bible shows how he is carrying it out, the Church provides the means in its worship and sacraments.

The God of the Bible is the Living God who gave his Son that we might have more abundant life. The anonymous "Religious of C.S.M.V." draws out the significance of this theme in connexion with worship, prayer, Bible reading, and the devotional life generally. Her deep insight, practical common-sense, and clear, happy style of writing recommend her latest book *This is Life* to all who feel that their religion needs freshening up; and who doesn't? It is sub-titled a Book for the Busy. Rather it is a book for those who make it their business to choose the good part that shall not be taken away.

KENNETH A. PEARSON.

EWHURST.

CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY. By J. V. Langmead Casserley. Longmans. 1960. 21s.

FRANÇOIS DE SALES. By Michael de la Bedoyère. Collins. 1960. 18s.

There seems to be a tendency for theologians to produce books which remain to be completed in as yet unpublished volumes. In the case of Dr Casserley's essay on the church, its status and function, this is all the more unfortunate. What is *Christian* existentialism? He promises us a further book to answer this, yet assumes we already know as he formulates his doctrine of the church. Existentialism is concerned to a large extent with being, the church with becoming. Can there then be a true concept of being which completely foreshadows this becoming? Since very rightly, and here many will support the author, he starts from holy scripture and the idea of the Remnant, it would also seem necessary to know whether existentialism implies—or even demands—a particular interpretation of scripture. All this is not petty cavilling, for this hurried argument keeps glancing back at these basic questions. It would appear that existentialism demands, even if this is inconsistent with the New Testament, a distinction between the Church Militant and the Body of Christ, though both are supernatural. The sacramental relationship between these two supernaturals is essentially mediated to the Church by means of the historic episcopacy which is the *esse*, rather than the *bene esse*, of the whole Church. Combined with this is the questionable suggestion that "Liturgy is the true criterion of sound doctrine". On Anglicanism, its ecumenical position, its future and the revision of the Prayer Book, there are some interesting, though scarcely original, remarks. The Anglican principle of *sound learning*, which is not the same thing as sound doctrine, is however entirely overlooked; and its neglect may be the reason that the necessity for preaching the oracles of God is belittled.

The importance of preaching for the life of the church comes out very clearly in Mr Bedoyère's excellent life of St François de Sales. De Sales, gentleman, scholar and saint; reformer, preacher, spiritual director and confessor, is well known for his writings. Yet these are not the only fruits of an amazing life lived both humbly and forcibly for the glory of God. He could walk about as Bishop of Geneva by day and sleep as François de Sales by night. He loved all humanity with a power that can only be called divine, and had, not without a good reason, a special regard for innkeepers. The French court, the wily Henri IV and political affairs took up a good deal of his time. Out of what was often a very debased side of ecclesiastical affairs arose his great opportunities and spiritual work. His close, intimate friendship with Jeanne de Chantal that led to the foundation of the Order of the Visitation is here told with insight and understanding. It was this relationship, for which it is hard to find a suitable word—their contemporaries spoke of it as a "charming misunderstanding"—which led to the *Introduction to the Devout Life* in the form we now know it, though originally it was addressed to Mme de Charmoisy. Fully to appreciate these we have perhaps

to see them in the light of his own times; when, for example, a favourite time for political talks was during high mass, or the abbess who had twelve children by twelve different men and still kept her office. Now an outstanding piece of English biographical literature has come from the dignified pen of Mr Bedoyère which does full justice to St François's own taste for fine writing.

W. S. Boycott.

Ewen Farm House,
Nr Cirencester, Glos.

The Life of St Thomas Aquinas. By Kenelm Foster, O.P. Longmans. 30s.

The Meaning of Love. By Robert Johann, S.J. Chapman. 16s.

Happiness and Contemplation. By Josef Pieper. Translated by Richard and Clara Winston. Faber. 12s. 6d.

This life of Aquinas is not a "life" in the accepted meaning of the term, but a selection of some of the material which is available for biographical study. The editor, who has translated and impressively annotated the sources, has as his aim "to gain, through the records of him left us by his contemporaries, some acquaintance with St Thomas the man" and "to show the man through the documents, letting them speak for themselves". The documents given include most of the *Life of St Thomas Aquinas* by Bernard Gui (who worked over Tocca's material, but was a Frenchman who only visited Italy for a year and did not publish the document in its revised state until about 1323), part of the canonization inquiry of 1319, and excerpts from Tolomeo of Lucca (who was twelve years junior to Thomas but died after the canonization) and from Gerard de Frachet (about 1260, but with very few allusions to Thomas). The appendices provide an informative account of the family of Thomas and an Italian sonnet said to be his work, although "it is exceedingly doubtful whether St Thomas wrote the sonnet". These documents are scanty. They are here presented with modest claims. For example, the editor characteristically admits of "the noble rhymed prayer *Adoro te devote*" that "its authenticity, though probable, is not beyond dispute".

The alert reader will detect from time to time episodes in these records in which history melts into hagiography. Details which have been uncritically repeated do not take kindly to being critically read. But the adulation, even the accent on miracles, need not cause undue disturbance. The mood is not to be dismissed as merely medieval. We have the inaccuracies of Walton's *Lives*, and similar parallels can occur in the account of a bishop, missionary or hermit written by devotees to-day.

This material has not before been made so conveniently available to the British reader, and the boldness of the volume is its combination of candour with the hagiography. In this regard it can have a salutary effect upon all whose special concern it is to present to

our own contemporaries the life of Aquinas. It now appears that preachers, lecturers, tract writers—and the author of the relevant article in the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Religion*—may have been too sure of their facts. We now encounter uncertainty about the dates, not only of the birth, but also of the death, of Aquinas. In addition to the year, there is the day. With so strong a tradition for March 9th, ought we to continue to observe March 7th? Again, his father was not a Count, but a Knight. "One cannot be sure of" how many brothers and sisters he had—eleven or less. Nor may we cherish any longer the Chestertonian certainty about the abduction and seduction scenes. The editor's notes disclose that not a little speculation has gained ground up till now, and they will have done a service to the cause of accuracy if they put an end to this.

But interest in the biographical details of Aquinas is secondary to the exegesis of his teachings, and here the thomist will always write with a firmer hand. We have two striking examples before us. *The Meaning of Love* develops the theme that "direct love is encounter with the Absolute, and openness to such an encounter is a man's first step towards paradise". The nature of this volume is indicated by its sub-title, "an Essay towards a Metaphysics of Intersubjectivity". It was prepared mainly at Louvain. It draws heavily upon continental work, comparing commentators and fully illustrating the argument from the text of Aquinas. Rich in thought though it is, this is an inbred thomism. The one chance of a break through occurs in the central chapter, whose title is "I and Thou"; but this is missed. There is no mention of Martin Buber by name.

Dr Pieper travels towards the same destination by a different route. He phrases his ultimate maxim for mankind as "the greatest happiness man can achieve is contemplation". Some of the same key quotations from Aquinas are repeated; but now these are planted spaciously in a wider landscape and show more growth. There is a noticeably more liberal circle of authorities cited: extending to Santayana, Kierkegaard and at last Buber. Both in style and argument this is a study which makes contact with non-thomist thought; which suggests that these three books should be read in reverse order to that in which we have mentioned them.

W. W. S. March.

Eastbourne.

BOOK NOTES

Rudolf Otto's well-known book *The Idea of the Holy* is now available as a Pelican Book (3s. 6d.); when the English translation by J. W. Harvey was first published, it was reviewed in Theology, April 1924, pp. 230–3, by A. E. Taylor, who wrote: "I cannot say adequately how completely I feel in accord with the main thought of Dr Otto's book." William Temple's *Christianity and the Social Order* is also available as a Pelican Book (3s. 6d.). S.P.C.K. has published a useful list of 368 religious and theological books, most of which are paper-backs: it is entitled *6s. and Under* (1s. 6d.), and has been compiled by

Mr J. L. Houlden, the Chaplain of Chichester Theological College. It will ease the task of those who are asked to recommend cheap books on theological subjects. S.P.C.K. has also published *Knutsford: the Story of the Ordination Test School, 1918–1941* (2s. 6d.) by the Ven. R. V. H. Burne, who was Principal of the School from 1923 till 1937. A new and revised edition of *The Church of Rome: a Dissuasive* by R. P. C. Hanson and R. H. Fuller has come from the S.C.M. Press (6s.): it is one of the most useful books of its kind. S.P.C.K. has published a new edition of *The Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical* (of 1603): amendments promulgated in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries are incorporated; the price is 12s. 6d. A new edition of Salomon Reinach's *Orpheus: a history of religions* has been produced by Peter Owen (42s.). From the Church Book Room Press comes a booklet about *Jehovah's Witnesses* in its Modern Heresies series: it is by M. C. Burrell (1s.). *The Secret Sayings of Jesus* (Fontana Books, 2s. 6d.) is a translation of the Gospel of Thomas with introduction and notes by R. M. Grant and D. N. Freedman: on the Gospel of Thomas, see also THEOLOGY, August–September 1959, "New Gospel Discoveries", and March 1960, p. 130. A cheap edition of *Baptism and Confirmation*, the Report of the Liturgical Commission in November 1958, has now appeared (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.). Last, but not least, there is Dr Austin Farrer's *Said or Sung* (Faith Press, 16s.), which is based on sermons that were mostly given to Oxford undergraduates, but their appeal will not be confined to them. Many readers of THEOLOGY will find in this book just what they are looking for in the way of spiritual reading.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ANGLICAN TRUTH SOCIETY (SYDNEY, N.S.W.): *The Parish Eucharist* (4s.).

AUBIER (PARIS): Louis Bouyer, *La Spiritualité du Nouveau Testament et des Pères* (n.p.).

BURNS AND OATES: George H. Tavard, *Protestantism* (8s. 6d.); René Metz, *What is Canon Law?* (8s. 6d.).

CHAPMAN: Louis Bouyer, *Erasmus and the Humanist Experiment* (18s.).

COLLINS: John Knox, *Philemon among the Letters of Paul* (10s. 6d.); J. W. Stevenson, *God in my Unbelief* (12s. 6d.).

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS (O.U.P.): R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity* (31s. 6d.).

DARTON, LONGMAN AND TODD: Josef A. Jungmann, S.J., *The Early Liturgy* (50s.); Ancilla, *Within the Church* (15s.).

EPWORTH PRESS: W. J. Brown, *The Life of Rowland Taylor* (21s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: Stephen Neill, *Christian Holiness* (15s.); E. R. Hardy, *Faithful Witnesses* (2s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: Derek Tasker, *Vocation and Work* (5s.).

OLIVER AND BOYD: Walter Lüthi, *St John's Gospel* (25s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Peter Hinchliff, *The South African Liturgy* (21s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: W. R. F. Browning, *The Gospel according to St Luke* (12s. 6d.); Pierre Maury, *Predestination and other Papers* (12s. 6d.); R. P. C. Hanson, *God: Creator, Saviour, Spirit* (8s. 6d.); Eduard Schweizer, *Lordship and Discipleship* (10s. 6d.); Neville Clark, *Call to Worship* (7s. 6d.); B. M. Metzger and others, *Introduction to the Bible* (6s.); C. T. Fritsch, *Genesis* (6s.); Jacob Myers, *Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah* (6s.); D. G. Miller, *St Luke* (6s.); A. M. Hunter, *Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians* (6s.).

S.P.C.K.: D. R. Dendy, *The Use of Lights in Christian Worship* (30s.).

TYNDALE PRESS: H. M. Carson, *The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians and Philemon* (7s. 6d.).

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES: *Dilemmas and Opportunities: Christian Action in Rapid Social Change* [report of an international study conference] (2s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON